UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,284	11/25/2003	Josc E. Korncluk	CE11781JSW	9078

24273 7590 02/22/2007

MOTOROLA, INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION
LAW DEPT
8000 WEST SUNRISE BLVD
FT LAUDERDAL, FL 33322

EXAMINER	
DEAN, RAYMOND S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2618	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/722,284	KORNELUK, JOSE E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Raymond S. Dean	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 November 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed November 30, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion on Page 11, 1st Paragraph "Thus, Childress does not show Applicant's claim limitation of first indicating ...". Childress teaches first indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, that a user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission (See Column 12 lines 19 – 33, the audible beep is the push-to-talk indicator) and initiating, by the wireless device, subsequent to the first indicating, a connection setup procedure with a wireless network (Column 1 lines 13 – 31, Column 12 lines 19 – 33, consider the following scenario: a user, desiring to make a transmission, presses the PTT button which causes an audible beep, which is a PTT indicator, indicating to the user that he or she may not provide audio for transmission, the same user can at a later time, which is subsequent to the audible beep, press the PTT again to initiate or establish a connection). Spayth teaches a PTT system comprising a non-audible push-to-talk indicator (Column 11 lines 7 – 8, lines 21 – 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the non-audible push-to-talk indicator of Spayth as an alternative means for indicating to the user in the Lampe in view of Childress system that he/she can/cannot transmit on a channel. The combination of Childress and Spayth thus read on the limitation in question.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. The claimed invention, as defined by Claims 20 – 23, is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claimed "computer instructions" are not necessarily encoded or embodied or stored on the computer readable medium. There is no interrelationship between the claimed "computer readable medium" with the rest of the computer to permit the functionality of the claimed "computer instructions" to be realized (See Pages 53 – 57 of the Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, hereafter, Interim Guidelines). Applicants have also defined the computer readable medium as transmission media, which includes wired or wireless means (See Page 19 lines 17 – 20 of Applicants' specification) thus Applicants are claiming a signal, which is non-statutory subject matter (Please also See Pages 53 – 57 of the Interim Guidelines).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 5 – 7, 11 – 12, 16, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampe (5,568,511) in view of Childress et al. (4,658,435) and in further view of Spayth (4,013,958).

Regarding Claim 1, Lampe teaches a method on a wireless device for providing a push-to-talk indicator, comprising: initiating, by the wireless device, a connection setup procedure with a wireless network (Column 6 lines 48 – 50); receiving a message from the wireless network indicating establishment of a connection in response to initiating the connection setup procedure (Column 6 lines 48 – 54, the channel access signaling that provides allocation of the frequency channel and the time slot is the message received from the network); and second indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, subsequent to receiving the message indicating establishment of the connection, that the user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission (Column 6 lines 54 – 57, the push-to-talk indicator is the alert tone).

Lampe does not teach first indicating, via a non-audible push-to-talk indicator, that a user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission and initiating, by the wireless device, subsequent to the first indicating, a connection setup procedure with a wireless network.

Childress teaches first indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, that a user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission (Column 12 lines 19 – 33, the audible beep is the push-to-talk indicator) and initiating, by the wireless device, subsequent to the first indicating, a connection setup procedure with a wireless network (Column 1 lines 13 – 31, Column 12 lines 19 – 33, consider the following scenario: a

user, desiring to make a transmission, presses the PTT button which causes an audible beep, which is a PTT indicator, indicating to the user that he or she may not provide audio for transmission, the same user can at a later time, which is subsequent to the audible beep, press the PTT again to initiate or establish a connection).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the push-to-talk indicator taught by Childress in the transceiver of Lampe for the purpose of enabling said transceiver to know when communication channels are available for transmission thus preventing said transceiver from transmitting when there are no idle communication channels as taught by Childress.

Lampe in view of Childress does not teach a non-audible push-to-talk indicator.

Spayth teaches a non-audible push-to-talk indicator (Column 11 lines 7 – 8, lines 21 – 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the non-audible push-to-talk indicator of Spayth as an alternative means for indicating to the user in the Lampe in view of Childress system that he/she can/cannot transmit on a channel.

Regarding Claim 5, Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Lampe further teaches the sub-step of sending a call request to the wireless network (Column 6 lines 48 – 50).

Regarding Claim 6, Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Lampe further teaches

detecting the user pushing the push-to-talk button; and receiving audio from the user for transmission (Column 7 lines 28 – 39).

Regarding Claim 7, Lampe teaches a method on a wireless device for providing a push-to-talk indicator, comprising: first indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, that a user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission in the absence of an established call (Column 6 lines 48 – 57); receiving a request to join a connection setup procedure with a wireless network subsequent to the first indicating (Column 6 lines 48 – 50, the user can receive the request to join at a later time after the alert tone); receiving a message from the wireless network indicating establishment of a connection subsequent to receiving the request to join the connection (Column 6 lines 51 – 54, the channel access signaling that provides allocation of the frequency channel and the time slot is the message received from the network); receiving audio from the wireless network originating from another user on another wireless device subsequent to receiving the message indicating establishment of the connection (Column 6 lines 48 – 57, the user can be any user); second indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, while receiving the audio, that the user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission (Column 4 lines 10 – 12, typical trunked radio systems comprising PTT will generate a talk prohibit tone or alert if the user presses the PTT button while receiving audio); detecting the passage of a predefined period of time commencing upon completion of receiving audio from the wireless network subsequent to receiving audio from the wireless network (Figure 2, Column 5 lines 58 – 66, the release window is the predefined time); and third indicating, via the push-to-talk indicator, subsequent to

detecting the passage of the predefined period, that the user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission (Column 6 lines 54 – 57, the push-to-talk indicator is the alert tone, when the user presses the PTT a plurality of times there will be plurality of alerts indicating to the user that the wireless device may provide audio for transmission).

Lampe does not teach first indicating, via a non-audible push-to-talk indicator, that a user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission in the absence of an established call and second indicating.

Childress teaches first indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, that a user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission in the absence of an established call and second indicating (Column 12 lines 13 – 36, the user of the mobile device in can also receive an audible beep after the PTT button is pressed when the repeater is not available, the repeater enables calls to be maintained thus if the repeater is off the air or not available there will be an absence of an established call).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the push-to-talk indicator taught by Childress in the transceiver of Lampe for the purpose of enabling said transceiver to know when communication channels are available for transmission thus preventing said transceiver from transmitting when there are no idle communication channels as taught by Childress.

Lampe in view of Childress does not teach a non-audible push-to-talk indicator.

Spayth teaches a non-audible push-to-talk indicator (Column 11 lines 7 – 8, lines 21 – 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the non-audible push-to-talk indicator of Spayth as an alternative means for indicating to the user in the Lampe in view of Childress system that he/she can/cannot transmit on a channel.

Regarding Claim 11, Lampe teaches a push-to-talk wireless device including a push-to-talk indicator, comprising: a processor for initiating a connection setup procedure with a wireless network (Column 4 lines 17 – 19, Column 7 lines 28 – 39); a receiver for receiving a message from the wireless network indicating establishment of a connection (Column 7 lines 35 – 39, the channel access signaling that provides allocation of the frequency channel and the time slot is the message received from the network); a push-to-talk button for pushing when the user desires to provide audio for transmission (Column 7 lines 33 – 39); and a push-to-talk indicator for indicating that the user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission after the connection has been established and the message is received from the wireless network (Column 7 lines 33 – 39, the alert tone is the push-to-talk indicator).

Lampe does not teach indicating that the user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission prior to receiving the message indicating establishment of the connection, if another user of the connection is presently using the connection to provide audio, or before initiating a connection setup procedure.

Childress teaches indicating that the user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission prior to receiving the message indicating establishment of the connection, if another user of the connection is presently using the connection to provide audio (Column 12 lines 19 – 37, the audible beep is the indicator, the audible beep will occur if the repeater is not available or the channels are busy, a check of the channels is made to determine if said channels are busy i.e. connections already established, if the connections are already established there will be an audible beep indicating that the user cannot transmit thus eliminating a message indicating the establishment of a connection, the check occurs prior to the establishment of a connection thus the audible beep indicating that a connection is not available will occur prior to the establishment of said connection).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicator taught by Childress in the transceiver of Lampe for the purpose of enabling said transceiver to know when communication channels are available for transmission thus preventing said transceiver from transmitting when there are no idle communication channels as taught by Childress.

Lampe in view of Childress does not teach a non-audible push-to-talk indicator.

Spayth teaches a non-audible push-to-talk indicator (Column 11 lines 7 – 8, lines 21 – 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the non-audible push-to-talk indicator of Spayth as an

alternative means for indicating to the user in the Lampe in view of Childress system that he/she can/cannot transmit on a channel.

Regarding Claim 12, Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 11. Lampe further teaches a transmitter for sending a call request to the wireless network when initiating a connection setup procedure with the wireless network (Column 6 lines 48 – 50).

Regarding Claim 16, Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 11. Lampe further teaches a detector for detecting the user pushing the push-to-talk button and a microphone for receiving audio from the user for transmission (Column 7 lines 28 – 39).

Regarding Claim 20, Lampe teaches a computer readable medium on a wireless device including computer instructions for providing a push-to-talk indicator (Figure 1, Column 7 lines 33 – 39, the microprocessor will run via computer instructions, said instructions are stored in memory device such as a RAM (30)), the computer instructions including instructions for: initiating, by the wireless device, a connection setup procedure with a wireless network (Column 6 lines 48 – 50); receiving a message from the wireless network indicating establishment of a connection subsequent to initiating the connection setup procedure (Column 6 lines 48 – 54, the channel access signaling that provides allocation of the frequency channel and the time slot is the message received from the network); and indicating, via the push-to-talk indicator, subsequent to receiving the message, that the user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission (Column 6 lines 54 – 57, the indicator is the alert tone).

Lampe does not teach indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, that a user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission, initiating, by the wireless device, a connection setup procedure with a wireless network, subsequent to indicating that the user may not provide audio.

Childress teaches indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, that a user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission (Column 12 lines 19 – 33, the audible beep is the indicator), initiating, by the wireless device, a connection setup procedure with a wireless network, subsequent to indicating that the user may not provide audio (Column 1 lines 13 – 31, Column 12 lines 19 – 33, consider the following scenario: a user, desiring to make a transmission, presses the PTT button which causes an audible beep, which is a PTT indicator, indicating to the user that he or she may not provide audio for transmission, the same user can at a later time, which is subsequent to the audible beep, press the PTT again to initiate or establish a connection).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the push-to-talk indicator taught by Childress in the transceiver of Lampe for the purpose of enabling said transceiver to know when communication channels are available for transmission thus preventing said transceiver from transmitting when there are no idle communication channels as taught by Childress.

Lampe in view of Childress does not teach a non-audible push-to-talk indicator.

Spayth teaches a non-audible push-to-talk indicator (Column 11 lines 7 – 8, lines 21 – 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the non-audible push-to-talk indicator of Spayth as an alternative means for indicating to the user in the Lampe in view of Childress system that he/she can/cannot transmit on a channel.

6. Claims 2, 8, 13 – 15, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampe (5,568,511) in view of Childress et al. (4,658,435) in view of Spayth (4,013,958), as applied to Claims 1,7, 11, and 20 above, and further in view of Huang (US 2004/0259586).

Regarding Claims 2, 13, and 21, Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 1, 7, 11, and 20. Childress further teaches indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, that a user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission (Column 12 lines 19 – 33, the audible beep is the push-to-talk indicator).

Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth does not teach a push-to-talk backlit button.

Huang teaches a backlit button (Section 0021).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PTT button of Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth with the backlight circuitry of Haung for the purpose of identifying said button, when using the transceiver in the dark or at night, more easily as taught by Huang.

Regarding Claim 8, Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 7. Lampe further teaches indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, whether the user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission (Column 6 lines 54 – 57, the push-to-talk indicator is the alert tone).

Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth does not teach a push-to-talk backlit button.

Huang teaches a backlit button (Section 0021).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PTT button of Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth with the backlight circuitry of Haung for the purpose of identifying said button, when using the transceiver in the dark or at night, more easily as taught by Huang.

Regarding Claim 14, Lampe in view of Childress in view of Spayth and in further view of Huang teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 13. Huang further teaches a backlit button that emits a red colored light (Section 0021, Section 0027 lines 1 – 2).

Regarding Claim 15, Lampe in view of Childress in view of Spayth and in further view of Huang teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 14. Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Huang teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 14. Lampe further teaches indicating that user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission (Column 6 lines 54 – 57, the alert tone is the indicator).

Huang further teaches a backlit button that emits a green colored light (Section 0021, Section 0027 lines 1 – 2).

7. Claims 3 – 4, 9, and 22 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampe (5,568,511) in view of Childress et al. (4,658,435) in view of Spayth (4,013,958), as applied to Claims 1, 7, and 20 above, and further in view of Haung (US 2004/0259586).

Regarding Claims 3, 9, and 22, Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 1, 7, and 20. Childress further teaches indicating, via a/the push-to-talk indicator, that a/the user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission (Column 12 lines 19 – 33, the audible beep is the push-to-talk indicator).

Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth does not teach a push-to-talk backlit button that is lit in red color.

Haung teaches a backlit button that is lit in red color (Section 0021, Section 0027 lines 1 – 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PTT button of Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth with the backlight circuitry of Haung for the purpose of identifying said button, when using the transceiver in the dark or at night, more easily as taught by Huang.

Regarding Claim 4, Lampe in view of Childress in view of Spayth and in further view of Huang teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 3. Lampe further teaches indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, that user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission (Column 6 lines 54 – 57, the alert tone is the indicator). Huang further teaches a backlit button that is lit in green color (Section 0021, Section 0027).

Regarding Claim 23, Lampe in view of Childress in view of Spayth and in further view of Huang teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 22. Lampe further teaches indicating, via the push-to-talk indicator, that user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission (Column 6 lines 54 – 57, the alert tone is the indicator). Huang further teaches a backlit button that is lit in a green color (Section 0021, Section 0027 lines 1 – 2).

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampe (5,568,511) in view of Childress et al. (4,658,435) in view of Spayth (4,013,958) as applied to Claim 7 above, and further in view of Haung (US 2004/0259586).

Regarding Claim 10, Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 7. Lampe further teaches indicating, via the push-to-talk indicator, that the user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission (Column 6 lines 54 – 57, the alert tone is the indicator).

Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth does not teach a push-to-talk backlit button that is lit in green color.

Haung teaches a backlit button that is lit in green color (Section 0021, Section 0027 lines 1 – 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PTT button of Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth with the backlight circuitry of Haung for the purpose of identifying said button, when using the transceiver in the dark or at night, more easily as taught by Huang.

9. Claims 17 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampe (5,568,511) in view of Childress et al. (4,658,435) in view of Spayth (4,013,958) as applied to Claim 11 above, and further in view of Huang (US 2004/0259586).

Regarding Claim 17, Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 11. Lampe further teaches a push-to-talk indicator (Column 6 lines 54 – 57, the alert tone is the push-to-talk indicator).

Lampe in view of Childress and in further view of Spayth does not teach a push-to-talk indicator comprising any one of: a graphic; a text message; a light emitting device; and a button.

Huang teaches an indicator comprising a button (Section 0021, Section 0027 lines 1 – 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PTT button of Lampe in view of Childress and in

further view of Spayth with the backlight circuitry of Haung for the purpose of identifying said button, when using the transceiver in the dark or at night, more easily as taught by Huang.

Regarding Claim 18, Lampe in view of Childress in view of Spayth and in further view of Haung teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 17. Childress further teaches indicating, via a push-to-talk indicator, that a user of the wireless device may not provide audio for transmission (Column 12 lines 19 – 33, the audible beep is the push-to-talk indicator). Huang further teaches an indicator emitting a red colored light (Section 0021, Section 0027 lines 1 – 2).

Regarding Claim 19, Lampe in view of Childress in view of Spayth and in further view of Haung teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 17. Lampe further teaches indicating that user of the wireless device may provide audio for transmission (Column 6 lines 54 – 57, the alert tone is the indicator). Huang further teaches an indicator emitting a green colored light (Section 0021, Section 0027 lines 1 – 2).

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond S. Dean whose telephone number is 571-272-7877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:00-2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban can be reached on 571-272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Raymond S. Dean
February 12, 2007

EDWARD F. URBAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600